

of the above.” And they were right. They were right. If primary voters haven’t identified the best candidates for the job—not just decent candidates, but actually the best candidates for the job—the general election voters should be able to wave their fingers and say: Uh-uh, no way. I am not going for that until you convince we, the people, that you are the best candidate for the job, and we are going to insist on other choices until we find somebody who is.

Now, this will have a wonderful effect, a very important effect, on what we saw drenching us, the tsunami of negative advertising and negative campaigning that we saw on our TV screens and now on our computer screens and even our phones, this incessant drumbeat of negative campaigning. Why? Because both sides will understand that, if you indulge yourself that way, all you are doing is driving down votes below “none of the above” and elevating “none of the above” above your candidate.

Let’s replace this terrible malignant notion of vote against him/vote against her with something called vote for me—and here is why. Here is what I will do to improve your life. What am I going to do for you, not what am I going to do to you.

Now, in addition to that, I see a big boost in turnout. Last time I checked, which was a few days ago, the total number of votes in the 2016 Presidential election was lower than the total number of votes in the 2012 Presidential election and the 2008 Presidential election and the 2004 Presidential election. As of a few days ago, you had to go all the way back to 2000 to find any national Presidential election where fewer people voted. And here is the really strange thing: back in 2000, we had 40 million fewer Americans.

I think there are a lot of people who will show up for the specific purpose of voting for “none of the above.” I think we will see a massive increase in turnout if we simply convey to people the right to reject all the candidates, which is exactly how they feel.

In addition to that, we will be keeping elected officials on their toes. Ninety percent of the elected officials in this body, the House of Representatives, face uncompetitive races time after time after time. Two-thirds of all the races down the hall in the Senate are uncompetitive. When Members of Congress represent deep red or deep blue districts, they often run unopposed and they win with 100 percent of the so-called vote, which isn’t really a vote at all.

So knowing that, no matter what kind of district they are—red, blue, purple—no matter whom they represent, they will be facing “none of the above” on that ballot will put the fear of God in them. We need to do that. We need to make sure that the comfortable here in this room and down the hall aren’t too comfortable, and that even pampered incumbents in ger-

rymandered districts would have to work diligently to defeat the specter of “none of the above.”

□ 1930

Also, we clearly need to defeat the dictatorship of the primary voters. As I indicated before, 58 million American adults voted in the primary elections, and 191 million did not. What was the result of that? People who were deeply dissatisfied with the choices that they had. Let me show you what I mean.

Two days before the Presidential election, I asked in a national poll: How do you feel about those Presidential primary elections? How do you feel about them?

Almost 52 percent said they were disappointed. Only 48 percent said that they were pleased. Interestingly enough, that sentiment of disappointment was widely shared. Among Democrats, 38 percent said that they were disappointed. Among Republicans, 53 percent said that they were disappointed. Among Independents, who, in many States, didn’t even have the legal right to vote to choose a Presidential candidate in either party, 69 percent said that they were disappointed. That explains, in part, why we end up with a terrible Hobson’s choice on the ballot.

Above all, though, to be able to choose “none of the above” on each Federal ballot would show respect for the voters. In my State—the State of Florida—the Constitution of the State begins with these words: “All political power is inherent with the people.” If you really believe that in your heart—if you believe that the sovereign in this country, the royalty in this country are the people of the United States, the voters—then how can you possibly explain to them why we wouldn’t allow them to reject all of the candidates?

This is a practical proposal. I don’t know how many people have noticed this, but we have more than 2 months between the election and when the President is sworn in under the 20th Amendment. We have almost 2 months between the election and when the House of Representatives and the Senate are sworn in here in this building. It is not that difficult to put on a new election within 2 months. I know a lot of people who would favor having elections that take place in less than 2 months instead of approaching 2 years. In fact, it would be a blessed relief.

Now, I understand that most people who are elected officials would want to fight against this for their own selfish purposes. In fact, one of the liberating elements is the fact that I will be leaving this body in a couple of months. I will be leaving because I was defeated. I will be leaving this body, and that gives me the freedom to be able to do and say what is right and not what is for my own personal benefit.

I will point out that many, many, many people across the country believe that term limits are a good thing and that, somehow or another, term limits

have been maneuvered through the Florida legislature and the legislatures of many other States. And, of course, term limits limit the terms of elected officials. In the same sense, if term limits can ever be enacted anywhere, that shows that it is possible to actually put a choice on the ballot like “none of the above” that doesn’t favor any elected official anywhere—ever—but favors, instead, the voters and gives them a right that they should have but that they don’t have.

In case you are curious, you may wonder what would have happened a week ago last Tuesday if we had had that choice on the ballot. I know, and I would like to show you.

According to my poll, 40 percent of the American people would have voted a week ago last Tuesday for “none of the above.” If you were to delve further into it, you would see, of those 60 percent, 28 percent would have voted for Hillary Clinton; 27 percent would have voted for Donald Trump; 4 percent would have voted for the third-party candidate put up by the Libertarians; and 1 percent would have voted for the third-party candidate put up by the Green Party.

In short, think about what this really means. “None of the above” would have won, and we would have had the choice that human dignity suggests we should have—a choice involving new candidates to decide who rules over this Nation of 300 million-plus people and becomes the leader of the free world—a new set of choices, a better set of candidates, and a brighter future.

If we simply can’t stand the candidates we have got, we need new ones. Isn’t that obvious? Think of it as voting with your middle finger. We deserve this choice. As human beings, as Americans—as people who deserve to have full control over our own sovereign fate—we deserve the choice of “none of the above.”

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### A PERILOUS MOMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GALLEG0. Madam Speaker, our country is facing a perilous moment. In my district, parents are reassuring frightened children that everything will be all right. That is what parents do. Our job as Members of Congress is to do the best we can to make sure that those reassurances come true.

Madam Speaker, I was born and raised in Chicago. In 2000, I voted for the first time in my life. I voted for Barack Obama to serve in this Chamber. While he did not win that election, I was inspired by his message of reform, change, and hope. Throughout his life and career, Barack Obama has always tried to bring people together.

Even in a highly polarized and tumultuous time, he has always tried to rise above and bridge those divisions and to be a unifying force for good.

This is who Barack Obama is. This is who he was at Harvard Law School. This is who he was as a community organizer in Chicago. This is who he was as a State senator, and as our President.

Right now, President Obama is discharging his constitutional obligation to orchestrate an orderly transition of power to a new President. I understand and I respect why, under those circumstances, he has chosen to emphasize a message of national unity. I understand and respect why Hillary Clinton, who, despite the painful knowledge that she received more votes than her opponent, is doing the same.

But I feel that I have an obligation at this moment, as do many of my colleagues in this House—I have a duty—to tell the truth about Donald Trump. We cannot treat him like any other politician or like any other Republican because he is not. Trump represents something much more dangerous; and while none of us want this to be the case, we have a duty to treat him like the threat that he is—a threat to our values, a threat to our people, and a threat to our national identity.

Donald Trump is 70 years old, and it is unrealistic to expect him to change at this moment in time. Donald Trump is a sexual predator who brags about grabbing women without their consent. To date, he has been accused of sexual assault by nearly a dozen women. Donald Trump is a demagogue. His political mentor was Roy Cohn, Senator Joseph McCarthy's right-hand man. No surprise that Donald Trump burst onto the national conservative scene by peddling a racist birther conspiracy, questioning whether President Obama was even an American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

Mr. GALLEGO. Duly noted.

Donald Trump is a bigot. Even PAUL RYAN called Donald Trump's words, when attacking a Federal judge of Mexican descent, the "textbook definition of racism." Donald Trump is a liar. Senator TED CRUZ called him a pathological liar who is completely amoral to boot. Most of all, Donald Trump is a con artist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is again reminded to observe the decorum of the House and reminds Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

Mr. GALLEGO. Duly noted.

Next month, Donald Trump is going on trial for fraud related to the fake university that bore his name. A series of exposes in The Washington Post have revealed the systematic misuse of funds at the fake charity he established. In Atlantic City, he enriched himself at the expense of creditors, in-

vestors, workers, and suppliers while running multiple casinos into bankruptcy.

Every one of us in Congress—every single one of us in Congress—knows who Donald Trump is. It does not matter what he says today or what he does tomorrow. His whole life and his whole campaign speak to who he is and to what kind of President he will be for our country.

We should be horrified because it is horrifying. The man who boasted, I alone will fix this, will fix nothing. He has broken us apart. Millions of Americans are living in fear because he has threatened them—Muslims, Latinos, African Americans, women, the disabled, the LGBT community, and more.

Donald Trump will be our next President. We here in Congress must oppose his agenda. We must oppose his efforts to increase his power. Anything that makes Donald Trump more powerful makes him more dangerous.

Look at who Donald Trump is. Look at the life he has led. Look at the campaign he ran. No one should be under any illusions. Never more in my lifetime have we needed strong, aggressive, innovative, strategic leadership from the Democratic Party and the progressive movement that fuels it. Donald Trump will not be an ordinary President. Rather than helping him protect the country, we must protect the country from the new President.

Madam Speaker, this is uncharted territory.

In the days since his election, Trump has attacked the right to protest. He has attacked The New York Times for its critical coverage. He announced that Steve Bannon, a White nationalist racist, will serve as his senior adviser in his White House. He has committed to deporting 2 to 3 million immigrants immediately. His team has threatened legal action against a Senator who criticized him; and on the campaign trail, he threatened to use the regulatory powers of the Federal Government to retaliate against his critics.

Despite his promise to drain the swamp of corruption in Washington, he is stacking his transition team with corporate lobbyists. Trump is preparing to install foxes to watch the people's henhouse.

Last but by no means least, he has refused to engage in any meaningful financial disclosures or to take any steps to effectively mitigate the conflicts of interest inherent in the President of the United States and also being the head of an opaque network of privately held companies. We don't know who he owes money to, and we don't know who is paying him. He has installed his children and heirs to manage his company even while they serve as top advisers to his transition.

Given everything we know about Donald Trump and everything we don't know, I was alarmed by the words of senior leaders from both the progressive and centrist wings of the Demo-

cratic Party regarding their openness to working with Donald Trump on infrastructure. Under ordinary circumstances, we would welcome a plan to invest in America's infrastructure even if that plan came from the other side of the aisle—especially if it came from the other side of the aisle. But Donald Trump is not an ordinary politician. He is a con artist. He has refused to give the American people reason to believe that he is not in this to enrich himself.

In fact, he has bucked tradition by maintaining his family's interest in a private corporation. Unfortunately, his infrastructure plan is really a privatization scheme.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair again reminds the gentleman to observe the decorum of the House. Members are to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, duly noted.

He is not reaching out. He is reaching his hand into America's pockets, and we must not let him do it.

When President Obama took office, even Americans who didn't support him celebrated his election and what he said about our country, and we united in wishing him well. Here in Congress, however, Republicans announced that they would not lift a finger to help him lead our country.

As Donald Trump takes office, even Americans who did reluctantly cast their votes for him worry about what his election says about our country. And if we are united, it is our fervent hope that he does not govern the way he has campaigned. Here in Congress, however, we cannot afford to give him the benefit of the doubt. We must not lift a finger to help him scam our country. We must, instead, put every effort into stopping him.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 17, 2016, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7467. A letter from the Acting Director, PDRA, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Equipment Contract, RUS Contract Form 395 for Telecommunications and Broadband Borrowers (RIN: 0572-AC29) received November 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.